

1992 and which entered into force in 1994. Article 2 of that Convention commits the parties to achieving "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system." In addition, Article 4.2(d) requires that the parties review the adequacy of measures relating to the mitigation of climate change, beginning in 1998 and "thereafter at regular intervals."

We are writing to remind the Administration of its continuing legal obligation to participate in the COP negotiations in a constructive way that will aid in meeting the agreed-upon goal of "preventing dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system." In our view, a deliberate decision by the Administration not to engage in such discussions, solely because they may include the topic of future binding emissions reductions requirements, is inconsistent with the obligations of the United States as set forth in the UNFCCC treaty. In any event, the United States should, at a minimum, refrain from blocking or obstructing such discussions amongst parties to the Convention, since that would be inconsistent with its ongoing treaty obligations.

We would also like you to be aware that a bipartisan majority of the United States Senate has now agreed that human-induced climate change is real and that "mandatory steps will be required to slow or stop the growth of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere." On June 22, 2005, the Senate went on Record for the first time in support of mandatory limits on greenhouse gases by a vote of 53-44. The Resolution states that:

"It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a comprehensive and effective national program of mandatory, market-based limits and incentives on emissions of greenhouse gases that slow, stop, and reverse the growth of such emissions at a rate and in a manner that—

(1) will not significantly harm the United States economy; and

(2) will encourage comparable action by other nations that are major trading partners and key contributors to global emissions."

As this Sense of the Senate Resolution makes clear, the Senate intends, at some future date, to require a program of mandatory greenhouse gas limits and incentives for the United States. Moreover, that system will be designed to ensure comparable action by other nations that trade with the United States. This system, therefore, will build on the actions of the United States and other countries in implementing the UNFCCC. It is only a matter of time before Congress takes such action.

The United States Senate is on the path towards requiring mandatory commitments and reductions of greenhouse gases and supports working through and alongside the Framework Convention process. The Administration should remain mindful of that key fact in its negotiations with all Parties and comport any discussions about future obligations accordingly.

Sincerely,

Olympia Snowe, Jim Jeffords, John McCain, Jeff Bingaman, Susan M. Collins, Lincoln D. Chafee, Tom Carper, Chris Dodd, Daniel Inouye, Charles Schumer, Frank R. Lautenberg, Paul Sarbanes, Ken Salazar, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Joe Biden, Carl Levin, Jack Reed, Joe Lieberman, Maria Cantwell, Russell D. Feingold, Dick Durbin, Dianne Feinstein, Tom Harkin, John F. Kerry.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On Aug. 17, 2001 in Reno, NV, police and the F.B.I. arrested Adam Ezerksi for the murders of several gay men in Florida and San Francisco, CA. Ezerksi, a teenager, was suspected of being a serial killer of gay men. He confessed to the murder of Anthony Martilotto, a gay man in Weston, FL, who was found dead in a Fort Lauderdale hotel room. Police have linked Ezerksi to another murder of a gay man in Florida. Ezerksi was discovered while the police and the F.B.I. were pursuing another serial killer of gay men in the San Francisco area.

Our Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, in all circumstances, from threats to them at home. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a major step forward in achieving that goal. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Violence Against Women Act, which Congress has finally reauthorized after many delays. As my colleagues know, the final bill passed the Senate on Friday, it passed the House on Saturday, and it is now headed to the President for his signature.

As domestic violence leaders in my home State of Washington will tell you, this reauthorization is long overdue. VAWA has been a critical tool for fighting domestic violence, and it should have never been allowed to expire. The Republican leadership finally recognized that, and now we will strengthen and expand that critical law.

Today I want to discuss some of the improvements we have passed—including new tools related to health care, housing, and abuse that involves police officers. I also want to share my disappointment that the economic protections I have worked to include were removed when this bill was considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I have tried to advance critical economic protections at every turn, and I want to update my colleagues—and advocates in Washington State—about where those efforts stand. I do want to thank several of my colleagues for their hard work on this bill, including Senators LEAHY, SPECTER, BIDEN, HATCH, and KENNEDY.

The original Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, created a national strategy for dealing with domestic violence. And that strategy has been very successful. VAWA brought together victims' advocates, social service providers, and law enforcement professionals to meet the immediate challenges of domestic violence. This bill reauthorizes and strengthens those core programs.

This bill also creates new programs that represent important steps forward in areas such as health care, housing and officer-involved abuse.

The first new step concerns health care. For the first time, VAWA includes a national health care response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. It authorizes new grants to train health care providers to recognize and respond to domestic or sexual violence. These grants will help establish partnerships between victims service providers and health care providers in State hospitals and public health departments. It also provides funding for direct services for sexual assault victims, including 24-hour emergency and support services.

Second, this law now addresses housing inequities for victims by providing new grants to help victims find long-term housing. It also protects the confidentiality of victims who are receiving assistance from Department of Housing and Urban Development-funded programs. VAWA also now includes provisions to protect mail-order brides and expands protections for immigrant victims.

This legislation also addresses the issue of police officer-involved domestic violence. I have spoken about this issue on the Senate floor before because of a terrifying case in Washington state. In April 2003, Tacoma police chief David Brame shot and killed his wife, Crystal Judson Brame. Then he took his own life, all while their two young children watched. The final tragic act was the last in a long history of abusive events.

In response to this incident, the City of Tacoma, the Tacoma Police Department, and others formed a task force to examine officer-involved domestic violence. They created a new policy for the Tacoma Police Department, and they helped pass a State law which requires that departments have policies on officer-involved abuse.

This VAWA bill gives local communities new resources to deal with abuse that involves police officers. It funds the Crystal Judson Domestic Violence Protocol Program. It allows law enforcement agencies, victim service providers, and Federal, State and local governments to use STOP grant funds to create new protocols for handling officer-involved domestic violence.

What happened in Tacoma is a tragedy that cannot be weighed. Out of that tragedy, Washington State changed its laws, and now the Federal Government is giving communities across the country new tools to address

officer-involved abuse. So that new provision—along with the healthcare and housing measures—represent new progress in fighting domestic violence. But frankly, we have got a lot more work to do. I am deeply disappointed that the economic protections I have been fighting for since 1998 were not included in this reauthorization—despite some early progress.

If we are going to break the cycle of violence, we need to address the economic barriers that trap victims in abusive relationships.

We know that financial insecurity is a major factor in ongoing domestic violence. Too often, victims don't have the financial strength to leave a violent relationship. As a result, they are forced to choose between protecting themselves and keeping a roof over their heads. When a victim cannot afford to move out, or cannot afford to pay the rent, or has lost a job because of abuse, that person is trapped, and Congress needs to help free them from that trap.

In this bill, we had an opportunity to help victims. In the Senate version of the bill, I worked to include an unpaid leave provision. It was in the Senate version, but it was dropped by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In my view, that was wrong. It is like leaving someone trapped in a burning building. We should have knocked down the barriers and thrown open the exit doors, but the Senate failed and that will have a real impact on people trapped in abusive relationships.

The protections I sought were reasonable. It would have allowed victims to take up to 10 days of unpaid leave per year to address domestic violence. Over 40 percent of American workers get no paid time off. They cannot use vacation time to address abuse, and missing work puts them in danger of losing their job. My provision would have allowed victims to take unpaid leave to get a protective order, see a doctor, or make a safety plan.

But unfortunately, there was opposition and complaints about jurisdiction, and these protections were stripped from the bill during consideration in the Judiciary Committee.

Once those protections were dropped, I kept fighting. I offered another tool to help victims escape abusive relationships. I asked the managers of the bill to include a provision on unemployment insurance. I asked them to provide victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking with unemployment insurance if they have to leave their job or are fired because of abuse.

We know that a job is often the only way for victims to build up the resources to leave a violent relationship, but abuse and stalking can make it impossible for a victim to keep a job.

Many of my colleagues may recall the story of Yvette Cade, of Maryland. As reported in the Washington Post, Ms. Cade's estranged husband showed up at her job at a wireless phone store,

threw gasoline on her, and lit her on fire. A restraining order against her estranged husband had been dropped shortly before the incident, even though she had indicated he was still threatening her.

Ms. Cade was burned over 60 percent of her body and remains in the hospital.

There are many more cases of abusers who deliberately sabotage a victim's ability to work, placing harassing phone calls, cutting off their transportation, and showing up at the workplace and threatening other employees. When a victim loses a job because of violence, that victim should have access to unemployment compensation benefits.

Some people might claim that it is too expensive to allow victims to access unpaid leave. But I would remind my colleagues that domestic violence imposes costs on a workplace too. When violence follows victims into the workplace, it doesn't just hurt victims—it hurts their employers. It means less productivity and higher insurance costs.

So anyone who says it is too expensive to provide unpaid leave should also remember that domestic violence is expensive to businesses in both lives and dollars. Providing the tools that will allow abused women to escape abusive relationships can help offset billions of dollars in costs that domestic violence imposes on businesses.

Unfortunately, my efforts to include unpaid leave provisions were rejected as well. But I am not giving up. I have been at this since 1998 and I know who I am fighting for. I have been to the shelters in my State, and I have talked with the victims. I have met with their advocates, and I am not giving up on them.

I am going to keep pushing for my SAFE Act, which stands for the Security and Financial Empowerment Act. It contains the protections victims need to break the cycle of violence. I thank Senators LEAHY, CORZINE, DAYTON and DODD for signing on as original cosponsors, and would invite all of my colleagues to sign on as well.

I am going to continue to tell their stories because we need to hear their voices here in the Senate. It is easy to argue about jurisdiction, but that doesn't mean anything to someone who is getting beaten up every night. It is easy to argue about the cost of unpaid leave—but that doesn't mean anything to someone who needs to get a protective order so they can escape a violent relationship.

This Congress has a lot of work to do to help victims, and I will come to this Senate floor as many times as it takes, until we finally give victims the help they need and deserve.

IRAQ

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President I ask that the following editorial which was written by my good friend, former Sen-

ator Fritz Hollings, and published in the Charleston Post and Courier on October 27, 2005, be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISLED ABOUT IRAQ, SECURE IT OR LEAVE

A G.I. with his legs blown away in Iraq asks, "Senator, why did we go into Iraq?" Answer: "to secure Israel by democratizing the Mideast." Immediately my over-sensitive Jewish friends withdraw in horror: "There you go, blaming Israel." Not at all. The fact is that Israel opposed the plan. Now, with our unwarranted invasion and al-Jazeera reporting daily on U.S. "atrocities," we are spreading terrorism and have damaged the security of Israel.

In 1996, incoming Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel commissioned a think-tank headed by Richard Pearle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser. The three submitted the plan "Clean Break": Negotiating with Arafat is futile. Instead, secure Israel by democratizing the Middle East.

First bomb Lebanon. Next invade Syria on the pretext of it possessing weapons of mass destruction. Then replace Saddam with a Hashemite ruler favorable to Israel. Netanyahu rejected "Clean Break."

Determined, Pearle, Feith and Wurmser returned to the United States and joined in the Project for the New American Century with Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld and Scooter Libby, among others. In 1998, the group prevailed on Congress for regime change in Iraq, and the Senate by a voice vote adopted such a resolution. At the time, no senator thought we were endorsing an invasion—just encouraging resistance in Iraq. But when George W. Bush was elected president "Clean Break" hit pay dirt.

The Project for the New American Century crowd took office. Richard Cheney became vice president, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz and Feith took the number first, second and third positions in the Department of Defense. Richard Pearle became chairman of the Defense Advisory Board. "Scooter" Libby and David Wurmser were advising Cheney.

President Bush, days before taking office in 2001, sought a briefing on, of all things, Iraq from then Secretary of Defense William Cohen.

Secretary of Treasury Paul O'Neill tells in "The Price of Loyalty" how he was astonished at the first meeting of the National Security Council. He went to discuss the recession but all talk was about Iraq. The day after 9/11, President Bush turned to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, requesting a plan to invade Iraq even though Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. The administration was determined to invade Iraq.

Jason Leopold and Larisa Alexandrovna in "Raw Story" now report: "Although the CIA documents that Wurmser and his staff pored over showed Iraq as being an immediate threat, Wurmser was dead-set on finding and presenting evidence to Vice President Dick Cheney that suggested as much, even if the veracity of such intelligence was questionable."

"Wurmser helped Cheney's office, particularly 'Scooter' Libby, construct a case for war. He met frequently with Cheney, Libby, Feith and Richard Pearle, the former head of the Defense Policy Board, to go over the 'evidence' of the threat posed by Saddam Hussein that could then be used by the White House to build public support. Wurmser routinely butted heads with the CIA over the veracity of the intelligence he was providing to Cheney's office."

In short, the invasion of Iraq was not based on intelligence but was contrived. "But Senator why did you vote to go into Iraq?" Answer: I followed the rationale of the White